

## REMARKS

Claims 8, 9 and 17 are amended herein. Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration. Claims 5, 9-14 and 21-23 are objected to.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on Kurotaki is respectfully traversed. Independent claim 1 recites a cabinet having an opening in a top surface and a heating unit installed in the opening. The Examiner relies upon the roaster body 2 of Kurotaki as corresponding to the claimed cabinet and the gas burner 12 as corresponding to the claimed heating unit. However, as shown in FIG. 4 of Kurotaki, the gas burner 12 is not in an opening in the top surface of the roaster body 2, but is instead below an opening.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites the contamination preventing unit is shaped like a plate, and is removably installed in the heating space through the opening. As shown in FIG. 4 of Kurotaki, the juice receiver 7 of this reference is not plate shaped. Furthermore, there is no disclosure that this element is removable.

Independent claim 16 recites that the contamination preventing unit collects material from the food, which is deflected inside the cabinet. In contrast, the juice receiver 7 of Kurotaki receives juice which falls straight down, without deflection. Kurotaki, FIG. 4.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based on Winstead is respectfully traversed. As amended herein, claim 8 recites material from the food which is deflected inside the cabinet away from a center of the contamination preventing unit. It is respectfully submitted that Winstead does not disclose this feature.

The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Kurotaki and McLamb is respectfully traversed. McLamb does not overcome the above deficiencies in Kurotaki, and is not relied on by the Examiner to do so. Furthermore, the Examiner's combination is not proper. The Examiner's proposed motivation for the combination would have been to direct droppings from the food. However, there would have been no benefit to modifying Kurotaki to include this feature. McLamb addresses the problem of flare ups caused by grease dripping from the cooking food onto the heat source. McLamb, col. 1, ln. 23-32. However, as shown in FIG. 4 of Kurotaki, the gas burner 12 is not below the meat 9. Thus, there would have been no flare up problems in Kurotaki, and thus no motivation to modify the reference as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the

Serial No. 10/726,562

application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-1-06

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501